

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF TENNESSEE  
AT KNOXVILLE

Assigned on Briefs April 17, 2008

**GEORGE WRONDLE LEAMON v. SHEILA ANNETTE JONES LEAMON**

**Appeal from the Circuit Court for Bradley County**  
**No. V-06-1008     Lawrence H. Puckett, Judge**

---

**No. E2007-01604-COA-R3-CV - FILED JUNE 27, 2008**

---

Sheila Annette Jones Leamon (“Wife”) appeals from a judgment of absolute divorce entered in the trial court. Wife failed to “serve an answer,” *see* Tenn. R. Civ. P. 12.01, in response to the complaint for divorce filed by her spouse, George Wrondle Leamon (“Husband”), which complaint had been duly served on Wife. Husband filed a motion for default judgment on June 5, 2007. The record reflects that a copy of Husband’s motion for default judgment was served on Wife by mail advising her of a hearing on the motion on July 5, 2007. The record reflects that a default judgment was entered against Wife on July 22, 2007. A “Final Decree of Divorce” was duly entered in the trial court. Copies of both documents were duly served on Wife. Wife filed nothing in the trial court until her notice of appeal was timely filed on July 24, 2007. There is no merit in Wife’s appeal. Accordingly, we affirm pursuant to the provisions of Court of Appeals Rule 10.<sup>1</sup>

**Tenn. R. App. P. 3 Appeal as of Right; Judgment of the Circuit Court**  
**Affirmed; Case Remanded**

CHARLES D. SUSANO, JR., J., delivered the opinion of the court, in which D. MICHAEL SWINEY and SHARON G. LEE, JJ., joined.

Sheila Annette Jones Leamon, Cohutta, Georgia, appellant, Pro Se.

H. Franklin Chancey, Cleveland, Tennessee, for the appellee, George Wrondle Leamon.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rule 10 of the Rules of the Court of Appeals provides as follows:

This Court, with the concurrence of all judges participating in the case, may affirm, reverse or modify the actions of the trial court by memorandum opinion when a formal opinion would have no precedential value. When a case is decided by memorandum opinion it shall be designated “MEMORANDUM OPINION”, shall not be published, and shall not be cited or relied on for any reason in any unrelated case.

## MEMORANDUM OPINION

Wife's brief does not attempt to dispute (1) that she failed to file a written response to Husband's complaint; (2) that she failed to file a response to Husband's motion for default judgment; and (3) that she failed to appear for the hearing that was held on July 5, 2007. Furthermore, Wife does not challenge Husband's assertion and the papers in the record that reflect she was served with process on the original complaint and received copies of (1) the motion for default judgment; (2) the notice that the motion would be presented to the trial court on July 5, 2007; (3) the judgment by default; and (4) the judgment of absolute divorce. In her brief, Wife states (1) that the grounds for divorce asserted by Husband "were unfounded and untrue"; (2) that Husband's claims with respect to the addition to the parties' residence "are unfounded"; (3) that Husband's claims with respect to a list of personal items are, again, "unfounded"; (4) that a vehicle – a "1991 Chrysler LeBaron Convertible" – was "never mentioned" in the divorce judgment, was bought by her, and "kept by [Husband]"; and (5) apparently, that she should not have been burdened by the trial court with a portion of the attorney's fees of Husband and the "cost of cause." There is no transcript of the July 5, 2007, hearing in the record.

The brief raises no issues and asserts no arguments which would warrant a reversal of the trial court's judgment. Wife took no steps of any kind to participate in the legal proceedings below. Her contacts with Husband's attorney are no substitute for complying with the requirements of the law. "[T]he courts must not excuse pro se litigants from complying with the same substantive and procedural rules that represented parties are expected to observe." *Young v. Barrow*, 130 S.W.3d 59, 63 (Tenn. Ct. App. 2003). Accordingly, the judgment of the trial court is affirmed. Costs on appeal are taxed to Sheila Annette Jones Leamon. This case is remanded to the trial court for enforcement of the trial court's judgment and for collection of costs assessed below, all pursuant to applicable law.

---

CHARLES D. SUSANO, JR., JUDGE